

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(San Joaquin)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JULIO FRANCISCO ESCOBEDO,

Defendant and Appellant.

C059309

(Super. Ct. No. TF034669A)

On November 6, 2007, defendant Julio Francisco Escobedo punched the victim (his former girlfriend and mother of their child) several times. After the police arrived, defendant head butted her, grabbed her by the hair, dragged her to another room, and threatened to kill her if the police entered. Police entered with guns drawn and defendant surrendered. After defendant was handcuffed, he resisted while being escorted down the stairs. The victim suffered a black eye, bruises, a scratch, and a bump on her head.

Defendant entered a plea of no contest to corporal injury (Pen. Code, § 273.5, subd. (a); undesignated section references

are to the Penal Code), criminal threats (§ 422), and resisting an officer, a misdemeanor (§ 148, subd. (a)(1)), and admitted a strike prior [1997 California robbery] (§§ 667, subds. (b)-(i), 1170.12) in exchange for dismissal of the remaining charges and allegations and a stipulated stated prison sentence of eight years. The court sentenced defendant accordingly, that is, the upper term of four years for the corporal injury offense, doubled for the strike prior, and concurrent terms on the remaining counts.

Defendant appeals. His request for a certificate of probable cause (§ 1237.5) was denied.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

SIMS, Acting P. J.

We concur:

NICHOLSON, J.

CANTIL-SAKAUYE, J.